

**REMARKS**

***Formal Matters***

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Applicants also thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings.

Further, Applicants thank the Examiner for signing and returning the copies of the 1449 Forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on February 9, 2005 and January 26, 2006, thereby indicating that the documents cited therein have been considered. However, Applicants note that the Examiner did not initial all of the references cited in the 1449 form submitted February 9, 2005. Specifically, the Examiner did not initial the Chinese Patent No. 1,203,495 to Matsushita Electrical Industrial. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial the Chinese Patent No. 1,203,495 and return the 1449 Form to indicate that this reference has been fully considered along with the next office paper.

***Status of the Application***

Claims 1-27 have been examined and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,918,012 to Astiz et al. (hereinafter “Astiz”).

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Astiz. Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

For example, claim 1 recites a central control unit which is operable to receive content and that the received content is not received through the object-in-content information managing device.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Astiz's HTTP server 33 corresponds to the claimed object-in-content information managing device. The Examiner also asserts that Astiz's (x, y, t) data corresponds to the claimed basic content information and the URL loaded by the browser 32 corresponds to the claimed object-in-content information. Also, Astiz discloses that the (x, y, t) data describes Astiz's video (col. 7, lines 19-23). Thus, in order to satisfy the claimed condition that the alleged basic content information ((x, y, t) data) is of the content, it logically follows that the Examiner would correspond Astiz's video to the claimed content. However, Astiz discloses that the video data file is received by the browser 32 from the HTTP server 33 (col. 6, lines 39-41). Thus, Astiz does not teach or suggest that the received content (video data file) is not received through the alleged object-in-content information managing device 33 as required by claim 1.

Because Astiz does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is patentable. Applicants also submit that claim 4, being dependent on claim 1, is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Independent claim 2 recites that the object information transmitting unit is operable to transmit the response message to a central control unit, wherein the object transmitting unit does not transmit the content to the central control unit. The Examiner asserts that the features of Astiz correspond to the features of claim 2 as discussed above, except that on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Astiz's HTTP 33 server corresponds to the claimed object information transmitting unit. As previously noted, Astiz discloses that the video data file is received by the browser 32 from the HTTP server 33 (col. 6, lines 39-41). Thus, Astiz does not teach or suggest that the alleged object information transmitting unit (HTTP server 33) does not transmit the alleged content (video data) to the central control unit as required by claim 2.

Because Astiz does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 2, Applicants submit that the claim is patentable. Applicants also submit that claims 3, 5, and 6, being dependent on claim 2, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Independent claims 7, 12, 15, 20, and 25 recite features analogous to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1. Applicants also submit that claims 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 21-24, being dependent on one of claims 2, 7, 12, 15, 20, and 25, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. McKenna

by / Seok-Won Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Seok-Won Stuart Lee  
Limited Recognition No. L0212

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 12, 2007